

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
	10/797,625	03/09/2004	Subbarao Surampudi	06816-023009/ CIT 2209 C4	4751	
	20985 7590 01/31/2007 FISH & RICHARDSON, PC P.O. BOX 1022			EXAMINER		
				KALAFUT, STEPHEN J		
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022		S, MN 55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1745		
Į	SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS		NTHS	01/31/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/797,625	SURAMPUDI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Stephen J. Kalafut	1745			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period versilled to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		,			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 No.	<u>ovember 2006</u> .	, ·			
	action is non-final.	,			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) 26-37,44 and 45 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-25,38-43 and 46 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers		•			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2004 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	a) accepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) [_] Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 1745

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1 and 3-8 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 5,599,638 in view of Bloomfield (US 3,982,692) and Nakazawa (US 5,134,043), for reasons of record.

Claims 2, 9-11 and 13 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 5,599,638 in view of Bloomfield and Nakazawa, and further in view of Elzinga (US 4,040,435), for reasons of record.

Claims 12, 14 and 15 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 5,599,638 in view of Bloomfield, Nakazawa and Elzinga, and further in view of Nadler *et al.* (US 4,080,791), for reasons of record.

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 5,599,638 in view of Bloomfield and Nakazawa, and further in view of Lance (US 4,517,259), for reasons of record.

Art Unit: 1745

Claims 18-21, 24 and 43 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 5,599,638 in view of Bloomfield and Nakazawa, and further in view of Solomon *et al.* (US 4,877,694), for reasons of record as applied to original claims 18-21 and 24. Bloomfield discloses condensers, which would act as gas-liquid separators.

Claims 22, 23, 38-40, 42 and 46 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 5,599,638 in view of Bloomfield, Nakazawa and Solomon *et al.*, and further in view of Elzinga, for reasons of record as applied to original claims 22, 23, 38-40 and 42. Bloomfield discloses condensers, which would act as gas-liquid separators.

Claim 25 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and of U.S. Patent No. 5,599,638 in view of Bloomfield, Nakazawa and Solomon *et al.*, and further in view of Lance, for reasons of record.

Claim 41 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 5,599,638 in view of Bloomfield, Nakazawa, Elzinga and Solomon *et al.*, and further in view of Lance, for reasons of record.

Claims 26-37, 44 and 45 are allowed. Applicant's amendments have removed the previous rejections under §102 and §103.

Art Unit: 1745

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Figure 2 still includes the misspelling "OXIDENT". Appropriate correction is required. Other previously noted informalities have been corrected.

Applicant's arguments filed 20 November 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the amendment has obviated the double patenting rejection. This is not persuasive because the claims of Patent No. 5,599,638 recite a "liquid feed direct fuel cell", which would mean that the fuel is liquid.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1745

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen J. Kalafut whose telephone number is 571-272-1286.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00 am-4:30 pm.

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick J. Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

sjk

CECE 1700